

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-12 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claims 1-12. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9-12 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-12 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

In item 1 on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In item 2 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner cited various examples of alleged problems with the claims.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9-12 have been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter of those claims. Further, the language noted by the Examiner is no longer recited in the amended claims. Therefore, the Applicant's respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §112 rejections of claims 1-12.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

In item 4 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,052,714, issued to Miike et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Miike"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites "storing environmental conditions that are predetermined conditions for an event relating to information provided by a predetermined information provider, the environmental conditions being independent of any particular user." The Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features are not disclosed in Miike.

Miike discloses a method of providing abstracts of articles to a user according to a user profile stored for the user. Searched for words in the articles are weighted according to the user's interest, and the search of the articles is conducted on the basis of those weighted terms.

Sentences are accordingly extracted from the articles and combined to form the abstracts that are provided to the user. However, Miike does not disclose or suggest storing environmental conditions for an event relating to information provided by an information provider, the environmental conditions being independent of any particular user. This is in direct contrast to claim 1 of the present application.

The Examiner stated that Miike discloses, in Lines 32-36 of Column 3, storing environmental conditions that are predetermined conditions for an event relating information provided by a predetermined information provider. However, the cited section of Miike merely describes retrieving a user profile which is comprises of a plurality of predetermined themes or topics set for that particular user. The Examiner apparently cites this same information (i.e., the user profile) as another recited element of claim 1 of the present application, namely the user conditions acquired "from the terminal of the user through the network, the user conditions being input by the user and relating to and being specific to the user." However, the Applicants respectfully submit that it would be quite clear to one skilled in the art that the user profile of Miike cannot suffice as being both the user conditions and the environmental conditions recited in claim 1 of the present application.

The Examiner also stated, in item 14 on page 6 of the Office Action, that the environmental conditions of Miike is the user profile having user specific themes, topics and preferences which are interpreted to be "environmental", in that they are specific to the environment created by the profile of the specific user. Again, the Applicants respectfully submit that this is in direct contrast with claim 1 of the present application, which recites the environmental conditions as "being independent of any particular user." In other words, the same environmental conditions are available regardless of the user. Therefore, by structuring, in conformity with the environmental conditions, detailed information related to the event including customizing values of the information with respect to the user in accordance with the user conditions, the information providing apparatus is able to apply the same environmental conditions to the user conditions of any user and provide information that is customized for that user. Because any user is able to access his or her own customized information through the "generic" environmental conditions, a burden of supplying complicated information for any particular user is lessened for the information provider.

Therefore, Miike does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of "storing environmental conditions that are predetermined conditions for an event relating to information provided by a predetermined information provider, the environmental conditions being

independent of any particular user.” Accordingly, Miike does not disclose every element of the Applicants' claim 1. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Miike does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 1, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Miike, and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by Miike. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-8 also patentably distinguish over Miike.

Claims 9-12 of the present application recite similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. For instance, claim 9 recites “predetermined conditions being independent of any particular user and used to determine contents of the information with respect to the user,” and claim 11 recites “predetermined conditions of the information, which are independent of any particular user, to customize the information and determine content of the information with respect to the user.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9-12 also patentably distinguish over the Miike.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 9-12 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-12 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

08/31/06

By:

Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501